



Modesto Junior College
Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Workshop
Minutes
May 6, 2010

1. Ken White, MJC Interim President, started the Assessment Workshop with a brief introduction.
2. Session one began with K. Hart passing out an excel sheet displaying the 10 strategic goals/objectives for 2009-2010. Participants broke out into 10 mixed groups to focus on the *Annual Status Report* and the 10 strategic goals/objectives. Ten AIE members were selected to participate as a group leader for each individual goal/objective. The 10 groups met for approximately one hour to discuss, analyze, and add any missing or related information. Each group answered the following questions:
 - Did we capture all the essential things we've accomplished this year in the report?
 - If not, what needs to be added to the report?
 - What items did we miss that we need to be sure to do next year?

At the end of the session, each group leader reported out on the individual group findings. H. Townsend will compile the group's information into one document and forward the information to K. Hart.

3. In session two of the Assessment Workshop, KWD went over the ACCJC rubrics. There are three ACCJC rubrics:
 - SLO rubric
 - Program Review rubric
 - Integrated Planning rubric

KWD asked the workshop attendees to break up into three groups. KWD chose a leader to facilitate each individual group. A. Peek was asked to facilitate the group representing the SLO rubric. B. Sanders facilitated the Program Review rubric group. K. Hart was the facilitator for the Integrated Planning rubric group. Each group met simultaneously and answered the following questions:

1. Where are we now?
2. Where should we be?
3. How do we get there?



Modesto Junior College
 Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Workshop
 Minutes
 May 6, 2010

Each group gathered the following information:

Rubrics	Where Are We Now	Where Should We Be	How Do We Get There
SLO Rubric	Some authentic assessment for some courses and some programs. We are proficient.	Focus on use of results to further align institution-wide practices	Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes
Program Review Rubric	<p>We are between development/proficiency for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Little institutional dialogue 2. No feedback to P.R. 3. Timing for planning is off, not allow for incorporation of dialogue into framework of resource allocation 	Sustainable continuous quality improvement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongoing 2. Dialogue (common forum) 3. Stable achievable timelines 4. Need framework (addendum) 5. Report out/feedback 6. Locate other funding/grant connections 7. Demonstrate outcomes 8. PRNet access
Integrated Planning Rubric	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development/proficiency (50% say) 2. Proficiency/sustainable continuous quality improvement levels (50% say) 	Component plans need to be integrated	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through dialogue 2. Make "plans" comprehensive 3. Prioritize "educational effectiveness" in all planning

4. B. Sanders discussed the Assessment, Program Review, and Resource Allocation Workflow chart that he created. The chart shows the flow of all three items from submittal to approval using the PRNet database. The chart is available online at: http://mjc.edu/facultyinformation/instructionoffice/aie_mtg-documents09-10.pcf%20.html



Modesto Junior College
Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Workshop
Minutes
May 6, 2010

5. G. Whitfield gave an informative PowerPoint presentation on the Planning and Budget Committee's zero-based budgeting plan. After the presentation, some suggestions were given from some of the workshop attendees. Here are some of the suggestions:
 - Program Review to reflect zero-based not just additional funds
 - Clearer definition of "zero-based" budget
 - Committee to have sufficient time to analyze data/prioritization
 - Share unfunded needs w/college community
 - Build in dialogue about student-centered budget priorities
 - Timing better integrated with operations
 - Expand process to more fully integrate Program Review
 - Object code in Program Review?

6. A. Peek discussed the 2010 *Comprehensive Assessment Report*. The 2010 *Comprehensive Assessment Report* was distributed to the workshop attendees. The MJC Assessment Workgroup, writers of the report, established a mission statement, clarified a charge, created a cycle of outcomes assessment at Modesto Junior College, put into place an action plan, and designed an elaborate chart displaying course SLOs. The workshop members gave some feedback regarding assessment. Some members questioned where the SLOs are kept. A. Peek informed them that the SLOs are kept on the course syllabi. All information and documents related to the Assessment Workgroup will be posted on the Assessment Workgroup's webpage at:
http://mjc.edu/facultyinformation/instructionoffice/assessment_workgroup.html

7. KWD gave an accreditation update. KWD discussed the self study timeline. The group reviewed the *MJC Decision Making Manual* together. Here are some of the edits that need to be made:
 - Add Assessment Workgroup
 - Add Program Review Workgroup
 - Add Registration Workgroup
 - "Flesh out" information (membership, terms, meeting schedules, etc.) for these groups



Modesto Junior College
 Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Workshop
 Minutes
 May 6, 2010

- Remove “SLO Coordinator” position from AIE
- Add Enrollment Management and Planning Advisory Group
- Add Distance Education Workgroup
- Remove Student Success Committee
- Revise DSPS-Does it include CARE and EOPS?

The workshop attendees agreed that a taskforce should meet to edit the manual. The following people volunteered to be on the MJC Decision Making Manual taskforce: Rose Lamont, Judith Lanning, Mark Anglin, Michael Adams, Wendy Byrd (chair), Roseanne Faughn, and Pauline Rosado. The group selected will meet, analyze, and edit the document. The deadline given to the group is August 15th, 2010.

8. At the end of the workshop, the attendees gave feedback about the day’s discussions, meeting place, supplies, etc. Below is a chart reflecting the pros and cons of the workshop decided by workshop attendees:

Pros	Cons
Water was readily available	More fruits and vegetables
Working in groups worked well	Rubrics(6 groups vs. 3)
Pace was good	Larger font on media items and documents
Organization was good	Session 1 more effective if preloaded on computers for each group
Lunch was great	Different room location would be better and round tables
Dialogue flowed well	A humorous video to start workshop
A lot was accomplished	No lecture to follow lunch